

***Exploring Linkages***  
***Between***  
***Governance, Democracy-Building and Environment***

By

Nancy K. Diamond, Ph.D.  
Diamond Consulting

for

The Biodiversity Support Program

December 6, 1999

## Executive Summary

### ***Exploring Linkages Between Governance, Democracy-Building and Environment***

**By: Nancy K. Diamond, Ph.D.**

Both environment (ENV) and democracy/governance (DG) donor programs share a common interest in supporting changes in the rules of the game, new roles for the under-represented and new or improved relationships among civil society organizations and between civil society and government.

At USAID, there is ENV and DG staff and partner collaboration at the mission level, staff collaboration in the regional bureaus and scattered collaborative efforts in other bureaus and centers (ENV, DG). Most often, USAID units capitalize on synergies (e.g., between DG civil society, governance and human rights activities with natural resource management or municipal services activities) rather than co-fund joint activities. Some ENV projects work independently to incorporate DG approaches and are seeing DG results but much of this work is invisible to the DG community because it is not framed in DG terminology.

For the DG community, there are three main advantages to ENV-DG linkages:

To build up a greater constituency for DG work and encourage the development of civil society-government relationships, the DG community can benefit from closer association with the substantial networks and constituencies of the ENV community.

To encourage citizens to take on new roles in governance and democracy-building, the DG donor and NGO community can capitalize upon the "mom-and-apple-pie" nature of ENV issues and the value of the ENV sector as a incubator for responsive politicians.

To demonstrate the concrete benefits of democratic governance reforms, the DG community can draw examples from ENV activities where rules have been changed through a democratic process.

For the ENV community, there are three main advantages to ENV-DG linkages:

To link biodiversity with broader development concerns, the ENV community can benefit from closer association with DG networks.

To help train ENV partners to play more effective roles in environmental governance, the ENV community can rely on the expertise and political skills of the DG community.

To better understand how environmental governance is influenced by the overall governance and political situation, the ENV community can capitalize upon DG expertise in local and national political sensitivities.

Activities conducted through the Biodiversity Support Program (BSP) provide lessons learned for how environmental projects can incorporate DG approaches and achieve DG results. This cooperative agreement is supported by USAID's Global Environment Center and is implemented by the World Wildlife Fund, The Nature Conservancy and World Resources Institute. Through BSP partner choices and DG approaches for resource management activities:

Civil society organizations now play more effective and diverse governance roles (e.g., decision-makers, advocates, watchdogs, resource managers, monitors, fund managers).

New rules have institutionalized more pluralistic environmental decision-making, improved civil society access to environmental governance and improved the administration of the rule of law in favor of disadvantaged groups. These rule-related changes have led to more accountable and transparent government institutions and procedures and improved consensus over conservation priorities and strategies.

New relationships have been forged for environmental governance, among civil society institutions and between civil society and government at different levels.

## **Exploring Linkages Between Governance, Democracy-Building and Environment**

### **I. Introduction**

Both environment (ENV) and democracy/governance (DG) donor programs share a common interest in supporting changes in the rules of the game, new roles for the under-represented and new or improved relationships among civil society organizations and between civil society and government. The environmental community is recognizing the fact that environmental governance is fundamentally tied to the overall governance context, societal values and goals and political stability; governance is more often central to the success of environmental projects rather than an optional opportunity. The DG community is seeing that all DG activities take place within the bio-physical environment, particular natural resource endowments often shape governance systems and most DG activities have environmental impacts, either directly or indirectly. These impacts may include how indigenous rights influence access to natural resources, how NGO laws influence the activities of environmental NGOs, how the rule of law affects the enforcement of environmental protection/liability laws and how decentralization influences natural resource management. ENV and DG are further linked through their relationship to national security/stability. Political stability supports sustainable environmental governance and management; environmental stability and diplomacy supports democratic governance. However, both political and environmental crises can rapidly undo governments, environmental conditions and donor efforts.

Although USAID and other donors have generally cast ENV and DG as separate and competing program sectors, there is growing interest in ENV-DG linkages and an increasing number of activities that have managed to transcend programmatic boundaries.<sup>1</sup> Despite reductions in budgets and strategic objectives, ENV and DG donors and project staff are already collaborating on ENV-DG activities. Some ENV projects have incorporated different democracy/ governance (DG) *approaches* and achieved DG-related *results*, but specifically related to environmental issues.<sup>2</sup> As part of a demonstration effect, some ENV project partners have been able to apply these DG approaches to other sectoral issues (e.g., health, education) or contributed to overall governance reforms and democracy building. Some DG projects have supported environmental groups or issues in order to strengthen civil society, improve municipal management and gain recognition for indigenous rights and promote the rule of law. For most of the USAID activities, these non-traditional approaches, results and impacts do not appear to be fully reported to USAID/Washington. This under-reporting is particularly true for the process-oriented work of ENV projects, the impacts of environmental governance reforms on overall governance, the impacts of governance reforms on environmental governance and the environmental results of DG activities.

---

<sup>1</sup> Many people contributed ideas and opinions for this report. As part of an earlier communications study on ENV-DG linkages for the BSP, I conducted interviews or corresponded with 74 experts from the ENV and DG communities and did a limited literature and internet search. The informants included BSP and BCN project staff, USAID and partner staff and representatives from NGOs, universities, multilateral and bilateral donors and private foundations. The SOW and time allotted for these consultancies did not permit a complete inventory of all BSP and USAID activities or interviews with staff from all regional bureaus. Key BSP linkage activities were highlighted by staff and the remaining USAID examples were included because they were discussed by informants or were previously known to the consultant.

<sup>2</sup> Work by Pat Isman-Fn'Piere suggests this dichotomous approach to DG approaches versus results and Derick Brinkerhoff provides a dichotomy of environmental sectoral impacts and DG impacts (see Suggested List of Further Readings).

This report is targeted to donor/funder staff and partners who would like to better understand some of the important advantages associated with making these ENV-DG linkages (Section II). It includes the specific opportunities that have been used by one USAID-funded ENV project, the Biodiversity Support Program (BSP) and by selected USAID units (Sections III and IV).

## **II. ENV-DG Linkage Advantages: Seeing the Big Picture**

### **A. Definitions**

For any cross-disciplinary discussion, it is important to clarify terminology, avoid jargon and normative language. A simple definition of governance provides a useful framework for the discussion below, "**governance is about roles, rules and relationships**" (Urban Environmental Governance web-site, 1999). The notion of governance encompasses the state and civil society (economic and social actors, NGOs, community-based institutions, unstructured groups, the media, etc) at multiple levels (local, provincial, national, regional and international). The roles, rules and relationships of governance are both formal and informal and these elements are rooted in particular cultural, historical and material realities. Rules include policies, laws, regulations and informal guidelines. Relationships include networks, partnerships and coalitions. The term, "**environmental governance**" applies the tripod of roles, rules and relationships to the use, management and protection of nature and natural resources. Both governance *writ large* and environmental governance exist independently of political regime and reflect the values and goals of specific societies. However, governance which is more democratic is often equated with "**good governance**" (participation, transparency, accountability, rule of law, responsiveness, consensus orientation, equity, effectiveness, efficiency and strategic vision (Urban Environmental Governance web-site, 1999). Democratic governance is seen to be contributing to the overall "**democracy-building**" process in societies. Governance and environmental governance set the fundamental parameters for "**environmental management**" which refers to specific activities associated with the use and protection of natural resources.

### **B. Linkage Advantages for the DG Community**

**1. To build up a greater constituency for DG work and encourage the development of civil society-government relationships, the DG community can benefit from closer association with the substantial networks and constituencies of the ENV community.** In the United States and elsewhere, many people view environmental organizations as major forces in the political arena because they influence resource use, receive government funds and manage large budgets. U.S. environmental organizations derive their power from a large constituency of middle-class voters, bipartisan support from Congress, major philanthropies and corporations. In host countries, national-level environmental groups draw from a broad base of support that is a ready-made constituency for civic education and captive audience for mobilization activities. For example, the National Endowment for Democracy supported civic education activities by Kenya's GreenBelt Movement. At least some portion of this large environmental constituency is likely to be a potential constituency for national and international DG concerns.

**2. To encourage citizens to take on new roles in governance and democracy-building, the DG donor and NGO community can capitalize upon the "mom-and-apple-pie" nature of ENV issues and the value of the ENV sector as a incubator for responsive politicians.** Citizen interest is often greater for the issues of daily democracy (a

clean and healthy environment; access to and control over natural resources for livelihood) rather than the more abstract and episodic DG issues such as elections and parliamentary reform. Many people perceive environmental concerns as less divisive and partisan than other sectoral issues. Environmental issues have provided the initial entry point and catalyzed civil society mobilization in many places, e.g., Eastern Europe and the NIS, Brazil, Mexico, PNG, The Philippines. These issues have provided new opportunities for governments and civil society to practice different roles in governance. Many citizens concerned about environmental issues have been highly motivated to learn DG skills such as community organizing, lobbying and negotiating. Increasingly, citizens are voting out local governments that fail to deliver acceptable environmental services, protect environmental health and good governance. Based on the DG skills learned from governmental or NGO environmental work, some individuals are choosing to become politicians or starting political parties (e.g., the mayors of Panama City and Quito come from environmental NGOs; the former head of the natural resource agency for the Dominican Republic is now running for local office, Bulgaria's Ekoglasnost Political Party). Some politicians are focusing their campaigns on environmental issues.

**3. To demonstrate the concrete benefits of democratic governance reforms, the DG community can draw examples from ENV activities where rules have been changed through a democratic process.** Positive experiences with democratic environmental governance help put flesh and blood on the DG skeleton and animate these issues for citizens and governments. These experiences build social and political capital. They have the potential to promote and reinforce reform efforts for democratic governance and democracies. Positive environmental DG experiences can also help to increase political stability in high biodiversity areas within countries (i.e., these areas are often sites of high cultural diversity, ethnic tensions and human rights abuses) and lead to further diplomatic efforts between countries in conflict.

### **C. Linkage Advantages for the ENV Community**

**1. To link biodiversity with broader development concerns, the ENV community can benefit from closer association with DG networks.** DG experiences with supporting civil society organizations, NGO-NGO linkages and civil society-government relationships are a rich source of information for international environmental organizations who are re-thinking environmental governance and partnerships. Integrating biodiversity conservation and development concerns has already encouraged some ENV organizations and donors to widen their circle of partners beyond their traditional partners (governments, host country environmental groups and communities). New partners include community development and DG groups who also share a common environmental agenda. Many biodiversity conservation groups are now moving to a multi-country eco-regional approach and regional DG networks are potential vehicles to promote this new paradigm.

**2. To help train ENV partners to play more effective roles in environmental governance, the ENV community can rely on the expertise and political skills of the DG community.** In most countries, the DG community is better-positioned than ENV organizations to provide training to ENV partners in community organizing, coalition-building advocacy, negotiation, dispute resolution, media relations and lobbying. For example, the Indonesian KEMALA activity of the Biodiversity Support Program successfully relies on lawyers' associations, women's organizations and human/indigenous rights groups to provide technical assistance and training to environmental grantees. Other partnerships have formed for training and technical advice among Washington-based ENV and DG organizations.

**3. To better understand how environmental governance is influenced by the overall governance and political situation, the ENV community can capitalize upon DG expertise in local & national political sensitivities.** In order to undertake DG activities, the DG community has needed a nuanced country-by-country understanding of governance issues, civil society-government relations and democracy-building sensitivities. Environmental problems are embedded in a social and political context and require social and political solutions since they deal with competing values and goals regarding who controls, allocates and manages resources. A detailed understanding of DG issues is central to the success of environmental projects. With incomplete DG information, environmental projects can cause more problems than they solve (e.g. the detrimental impact of local and state corruption, local resistance, lack of ownership, short-term rather than long-term gains). To achieve environmental objectives, the ENV community must balance the interests of governments (even weak, corrupt and illegitimate ones), the business community, civil society organizations and local communities. The DG community can help the ENV community to craft flexible and tailored approaches to DG issues in each country and democratize environmental governance. DG assistance is needed to help the ENV community avoid government or business community backlash for being overly political and local political resistance for being overly coercive or blind to ancestral rights. Both consequences greatly undermine the long-term sustainability of conservation or environmental management efforts. The DG community can help ENV projects determine situation-specific strategies for how explicit they can and should be about pursuing environmental governance reforms and democratic process through environmental projects. In addition, DG expertise will be particularly helpful as conservation and other ENV projects scale up from local enclave activities to eco-regional programs with multiple governments and civil society configurations.

### **III. ENV-DG Linkages: What's Been Done by the Biodiversity Support Program**

**What is BSP?** The Biodiversity Support Program (BSP) is a USAID-funded cooperative agreement (1988-2001). It is supported by USAID's Global Environment Center and buy-ins from regional bureaus and field missions to work in a number of USAID countries. Three international environmental organizations, World Wildlife Fund, The Nature Conservancy and World Resources Institute, form the BSP consortium and support the conservation of biodiversity in developing countries. Their work is conducted via on-the-ground projects, research and analysis of techniques, information exchange and outreach. Under a separate cooperative agreement managed by BSP, the Biodiversity Conservation Network (BCN) provided site-specific grants to conserve biodiversity in Asia-Pacific and evaluated the effectiveness of enterprise-oriented approaches to community-based biodiversity conservation from 1992-1999. The discussion below of BSP activities includes BCN efforts.

Although BSP was designed prior to the advent of USAID's DG activities and during a political climate with far fewer opportunities to directly address DG issues, it has increasingly woven these issues into its approaches and achieved some DG-related results. BSP focused not just on biodiversity conservation but upon integrating conservation and development. The guiding principles for BSP include broad collaboration at all levels, local participation and strengthening local capacity. BSP's 1995 analytical agenda addresses "democratic social processes and partnerships."<sup>3</sup> A number of BSP core staff address DG-type issues in a cross-cutting way. Through the former Center for International Development and Environment and the new

---

<sup>3</sup> This analytical topic has at least three aspects: i) societal arrangements for protection and sustainable use of biodiversity; ii) decentralization, devolution and community-based NRM; and iii) partnerships for supporting community-based approaches. (BSP 1995)

Institutions and Governance Program (initiated in April, 1998), World Resources Institute (WRI) has devoted increasing attention and staff resources to environmental governance over the last several years

**Finding DG Opportunities in BSP Approaches.**<sup>4</sup> BSP choices of partners and activities have created opportunities to influence the roles, rules and relationships related to governance and help build democracy. BSP's choices of partners have been flexible and include ENV, DG and development organizations and government agencies. Four types of natural resource management activities (**environmental management plans, mapping, monitoring and enterprise development**) have provided DG opportunities. BSP or its expert partners have provided DG-related skills (e.g., community organizing, advocacy, conflict resolution, negotiation and priority-setting) to partners and modeled democratic processes

*BSP Partner Choices.* BSP partners provide advice and training, help manage national and local activities, serve as consultants, participate in BSP-convened grant review panels and participate as resource management stakeholders. In order to broaden the constituency for biodiversity issues and gain expertise in DG issues, BSP has expanded its partnerships beyond environmental/planning ministries, environmental NGOs/experts and local communities. BSP has worked with indigenous rights groups in Asia and Latin America and community development groups in all regions. In Indonesia, environmental lawyers, gender experts and communication specialists provide advice to local BSP grantees. While biodiversity conservation is of secondary importance to many of these groups, they understand the value of using environmental issues for broad-based, non-partisan political organizing and civic educational activities. At the local level, BSP partners with both formal and informal community-based groups. BSP has broadened environmental decision-making by supporting selection criteria for stakeholders that recognizes gender, ethnicity, class, caste and power. At the international and regional level, BSP also partners with international NGOs and groups who address DG and environment concerns (e.g., Native Lands, Center for International Environmental Law, North-South Center, CEFDHAC in Central Africa).

*BSP Activity Choices: Environmental Management Plans.* Typically, resource management and environmental plans have been the domain of professional resource managers/planners and are strongly influenced governmental and non-local priorities. However, BSP has experimented with participatory planning methods that incorporate multiple stakeholders at many levels and function in a democratic fashion. BSP planning processes have included professionals from many more disciplines; mixtures of governmental, non-governmental and private sector participants; and representatives from communities to international organizations.

*BSP Activity Choices: Mapping.* Maps documenting resources are usually sponsored by governments or universities, are often used to restrict community rights and enforce or protect state and corporate rights to resources. BSP has supported new methodologies in participatory planning that have proven to be natural grassroots organizing mechanisms for communities and provided the basis for reconfiguring local and local-national environmental governance. Once they are created, community maps have provided a common basis for local-state dialogue, helped civil society organizations to gain more secure footing in environmental governance and improved accountability. Communities and indigenous groups have used maps in court to support local and ancestral claims to natural resources and uphold indigenous tenure and customary law. Maps have also enabled citizens to become more involved in policy-making and

---

<sup>4</sup> The description of the activities found below refer primarily to those conducted by BSP-WWF, to a limited extent, BSP-WRI, and BCN.

planning (local and national) and prevented projects with negative environmental impacts.

*BSP Activity Choices: Monitoring.* Traditionally, environmental monitoring, data collection and dissemination has been the domain of governments, scientists and international bodies. Yet, governments have not always been accountable and transparent about resource conditions and concessionary activities and they have often been reluctant to collaborate with NGOs. Public watchdog activities have been hampered by a lack of information. With funds from BSP-CARPE and BSP-Kemala in Indonesia, the WRI Forest Watch Program is working with local NGOs, the private sector and national governments to build capacity to collect and analyze data. BSP-supported Geographic Information System (GIS) maps have helped under-staffed and under-trained government agencies to keep track of forest conditions and revenue. Participatory monitoring opens the door for public watchdog activities on forest concessions and management and helps to ensure accountability.

*BSP Activity Choices: Enterprise Development.* Many biological conservation projects believe that improved and sustainable livelihoods for local stakeholders will help to protect biological diversity by creating local economic incentives. BCN and BSP experience indicates that new entrepreneurs gain confidence and skills that they are applying to local environmental governance (e.g, taking on new roles, developing new relationships for marketing and creating new rules for secure resource access and sustainable extraction). In Sulawesi, a community enterprise group, local government, the regional planning authorities and park officials worked out more sustainable rules for honey use rights in a protected area and its buffer zone.

**BSP Impacts on Governance Rules, Roles and Relationships.** Focusing on the resource management activities described above, BSP has built partner capacity for environmental governance. BSP has provided advice, training and experiential learning. BSP partners have received specialized training in DG skills and/or have directly experienced and practiced democratic processes during planning, mapping, monitoring or enterprise activities. Partners have gone on to re-invent the environmental governance tripod (roles, rules and relationships) and at times, they have influenced non-environmental governance. BSP has helped level the environmental governance playing field by opening up government units to more participatory and democratic decision-making and helping civil society organizations to play more effective roles with new skills, information and partners. BSP has also contributed to the dialogue on environmental governance by providing support to the Kenya-based, NGO ACTS, for an edited collection on environmental governance in East Africa.

*BSP-supported civil society organizations now play more effective and diverse roles in environmental governance (e.g., decision-makers, advocates, watchdogs, resource managers, monitors, fund managers). Some BSP partners have been able to apply BSP-supported capacity to other governance issues.* BSP support enabled local indigenous communities in Mexico to effectively advocate for their rights, improve the accountability of local governments and mobilize action against local illegal logging and drug trafficking activities. Indonesian and Filipino environmental NGOs applied their new strategic planning skills to campaigns for environmental and social justice issues. Mapping activities in the Philippines helped to change rebel activity to mainstream political activity. Communities with maps and advocacy training have successfully negotiated for changes in policies and development plans in Indonesia, prevented the expansion of a newly-privatized oil palm plantation into traditional lands in Cameroon and stopped construction of oil pipelines in ancestral waters in the Philippines. In Central Africa, BSP-CARPE supported an NGO training workshop by Transparency International to improve participation and advocacy skills in regional meetings. In Asia, BSP trained public

interest lawyers in environmental issues and trained environmental lawyers to be community advocates.

*Through BSP support, new rules have institutionalized more pluralistic environmental decision-making, improved civil society access to environmental governance and improved the administration of the rule of law in favor of disadvantaged groups. These rule-related changes have led to more accountable and transparent government institutions and procedures and improved consensus over conservation priorities and strategies.* For example, in the Ukrainian small grants program for biodiversity research, BSP instituted and modeled democratic processes by using a fair, merit-based, transparent set of procedures for grant announcement, review and evaluation. BSP support for advocacy skills, community mapping and legal assistance for indigenous communities in Indonesia, Mexico and the Philippines resulted in favorable court judgements in support of territorial rights.

*New relationships (networks, coalitions, partnerships) have been forged for environmental governance, among civil society institutions and between civil society and government at different levels.* BSP has fostered new relationships among NGOs that include ENV NGO networks (e.g., Crimea and Indonesia), partnerships between ENV and DG and development NGOs (Indonesia and Mexico) and mentoring/advisory relationships (BSP-KEMALA and PeFor). New government-civil society relationships at the local and provincial level have been created in many places. Focus groups in Indonesia were a new means for government, private sector and grassroots representatives to discuss environmental policy. In Irian Jaya, a BCN-supported community group that had developed coral reef-based fishing and diving enterprises, successfully challenged government- and World Bank-funded research activities that were destructive to the reef and now have an enthusiastic government representative on their board. Ukrainians involved in BSP management planning activities in Crimea had their first taste of multi-sectoral, multi-organizational and democratic planning process.

At the regional level, BSP has supported the involvement of NGOs in regional environmental policy-related work in LAC (hemispheric summits, the Organization of American States) and Africa. In Central Africa, BSP-CARPE supported a new regional organization, CEFHDAC, of governmental forestry ministers and environmental NGOs that uses peer pressure to generate support for more transparent forestry practice standards. Together with World Resources Institute, CEFDHAC organized a CARPE-funded Workshop on Environmental Governance in Central Africa (Kinshasa) that helped to promote an awareness among environmental professionals that the central problem for environmental management is bad governance. The BSP-supported Transboundary Project in Southern Africa brought representatives from the government, NGOs, community representatives and the private sector together to assess opportunities and constraints for the promotion of transboundary governance and management of natural resources.

#### **IV. ENV-DG Linkages: Highlights of USAID Experiences**

At USAID, there appears to be increasing interest in cross-sector linkages, in general, and ENV-DG linkages specifically. Interviews with a selective sample of USAID staff from ENV (Regional, Global, PPC Bureaus and field missions), DG (Global, Regional Bureaus), other units (BHR/PVC and PPC/POA) and USAID partners indicate a number of activities. Table 1 describes a sample of these experiences.

In sum, there is ENV and DG staff and partner collaboration at the mission level, staff collaboration in the regional bureaus and scattered collaborative efforts in other bureaus and centers (ENV, DG). Due to stove-piped funding and reporting at USAID, these units are more often capitalizing on synergies rather than co-funding joint activities. These efforts usually fall under the DG areas of civil society, governance and human rights and include a wide range of natural resource management and urban/municipal environmental services activities. Also, a number of ENV projects (from G/ENV, the regional bureaus and missions), are working independently to incorporate DG approaches and seeing DG results. However, this latter work is often invisible to the larger DG community because the ENV community tends to frame their work in terms such as participation, partnerships, community-based activities, stakeholders rather than using DG terminology.

**Table 1: A Sampler of USAID ENV-DG Linkage Activities**

<b>ENV &amp; DG Collaborative Activities</b>	<b>ENV Activities</b>
<p><b>AFRICA Bureau (AFR)</b></p> <p>AFR is the only Bureau with a DG Strategic Objective for cross-sectoral linkages (SO 1). They are co-sponsoring studies on cross-sectoral linkages at the missions with <b>PPC/CDIE/POA</b>. USAID/Guinea &amp; USAID/Madagascar studies review ENV-DG linkages. Under ENV Strategic Objective 5, AFR support DG approaches and results through numerous projects (e.g., CARPE and others).</p>	<p><b>G/ENV</b></p> <p>DG approaches incorporated into global projects under Strategic Support Objective 1 (Increased &amp; improved protection &amp; sustainable use of natural resources, principally forests, biodiversity, freshwater &amp; coastal ecosystems, and agricultural lands) and with municipal environmental services activities. The BSP (described above), the Coastal Resource Management Project and GreenCOM, an environmental education and communication project, demonstrate DG approaches, influence environmental governance (with possible spill-over governance impacts) and build democracy.</p>
<p><b>LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN BUREAU (LAC)</b></p> <p>Regional ENV &amp; DG staff collaborated to add ENV issues to the agenda of hemispheric summits and supported environmental NGO involvement. Most ENV programs stress NGO strengthening &amp; NGO participation in policy making. DG programs support ENV NGO involvement in Inter-American Network for Deliberative Democracy and training for ENV lawyers to assist indigenous rights groups.</p>	<p><b>USAID/NAMIBIA</b></p> <p>The ENV Strategic Objective 3 supports increased benefits to historically disadvantaged Namibians from sustainable local management of natural resources and the DG Strategic Objective focuses on increased accountability of Parliament to all Namibian citizens. In ENV activities, women are benefiting most from community-based natural resource management activities for income-generation. Enterprise skills are translating to more confidence and public voice about NRM issues by women. More representative bodies are being formed for managing the natural resource conservancies.</p>
<p><b>EUROPE/EURASIA BUREAU (EE)</b></p> <p>NGO participation supported by ENV Strategic Objective. The regional urban unit recently moved from the Energy &amp; Environment Division to the regional DG Office. DG civil society funds have supported environmental NGOs due to their historic role in transition to democracy. Some environmental NGOs are supported by DG civil society funds in EE countries without an ENV program (e.g., Georgia)</p>	<p><b>USAID/BOLIVIA</b></p> <p>ENV aims to involve previously disenfranchised local stakeholders into NRM governance processes. The new Forestry Law permits management and formal use rights by local social groups for municipal forest reserves. BOLFOR (Bolivia Sustainable Forestry Program) is working with mission DG office (DDCP) to improve municipal capacity to manage resources more democratically &amp; sustainably. Protected area management is becoming more participatory, transparent &amp; democratic. Corruption has been reduced by improving access to forestry information.</p>

<p><b>USAID/PARAGUAY</b></p> <p>ENV work under a Special Objective is linked to the mission's only strategic objective in DG. The DG Strategic Objective 1 focuses on improved responsiveness &amp; accountability of key democratic institutions. The ENV Special Objective 1 seeks to improve management of expanded protected area system.</p>	<p><b>USAID/DOMINICAN REPUBLIC</b></p> <p>Environmental activities are being used to test DG principles for good governance at the municipal level and civil society development.</p>
<p><b>USAID/GUINEA</b></p> <p>ENV objectives for participatory co-management of forests linked to DG objectives for improved local and national governance through active citizen participation and civil society development.</p>	<p><b>USAID/INDONESIA</b></p> <p>After mission budget reprogramming induced by Indonesia's political and economic crisis, the mission created a Special Objective for strengthening Indonesia's democratic transition and the ENV Strategic Objective became a Special Objective for decentralized and strengthened natural resource management. ENV staff for natural resource management (Special Objective) successfully reframed their activities in DG terms. Future foci for the NRM program include: new roles, responsibilities and relationships between government &amp; civil society &amp; accountability issues; NRM broad-based constituency creation; transparent, accountable, inclusive &amp; empirically based local planning processes for NRM; information synthesis &amp; dissemination. OTI funds supported some ENV NGOs for pre-election civic education.</p>
<p><b>USAID/PHILIPPINES</b></p> <p>ENV objectives for enhanced natural resource management linked to DG objectives for broadened participation in public policy formation. The Coastal Resource Management Project and the GOLD DG Project have linked efforts in the field for coastal municipal management around local codes. Planned links may address municipal responses to global climate change.</p>	<p><b>USAID/NEPAL</b></p> <p>ENV work has focused on capacity development for, and broad-based participation in community-level forestry user groups and their federation. Through environmental education and communication activities, villagers have been linked to NRM decision-makers via participatory video and have presented their perspective at the national level. Economic participation of rural women (under SO 3 – women's empowerment) has relied on ENV enterprises.</p>
<p><b>USAID/EL SALVADOR</b></p> <p>Water has been a unifying theme for the mission's Strategic Objective Teams. The ENV team works on watersheds &amp; the DG team is looking at municipal water service delivery by municipalities. ENV communication activities have helped to put water on the radar screen for national and local politicians.</p>	<p><b>USAID/ALBANIA</b></p> <p>Under a Target of Opportunity, the Albania Private Forestry Development Project has supported more pluralistic environmental decision-making and an informed citizenry.</p>
<p><b>USAID/BULGARIA</b></p> <p>Because of their critical role in Bulgaria's transition to democracy, DG civil society funds support ENV organizations via the regional Democracy Network Project. Some of the same ENV groups are also involved in mission ENV activities related to participatory protected area management/biodiversity conservation (Target of Opportunity).</p>	<p><b>USAID/RUSSIA</b></p> <p>Through ENV activities in the Russian Far East on forestry and protected areas, USAID has been major player in the development of the Far East environmental NGO movement &amp; has helped Far East green NGOs to become sustainable.</p>

### Suggestions for Further Reading

Blair, H. 1996. Democracy, equity and common property resource management in the Indian Subcontinent. *Development and change* 27 (1996):475-499.

Brinkerhoff, D.W. and P.G. Veit. 1999. Links between democratic governance and environmental policy in Africa: guidance for NGOs and donors. Policy brief #5. June, 1999. Natural Resources Policy Consultative Group for Africa, Secretariat: World Resources Institute, Washington, D.C.

Brinkerhoff, D.W. 1998. Democratic governance and sectoral policy reform: linkages, complementarities and synergies. IPC Monograph No. 5. Implementing Policy Change Project, Phase II. Abt Associates, Bethesda.

Codrington, D. 1999. Democracy and community-based natural resource management. Unpublished draft paper, July 30, 1999. USAID/G/ENV/ENR, Washington, D.C.

Diamond, N.K. 1999. Communicating linkages between environment and democracy-governance. October 25, 1999. Consultant's report prepared for the Biodiversity Support Program, Washington, D.C.

Isman-Fn'Piere, P. 1999. DG Cross Sector Linkages. Unpublished draft paper. USAID/G/DG, Washington, D.C.

Lippman, H., Charlick, R., Ribot, J. and R. Groelsma. 1999. Draft – Democracy and governance cross sectoral linkages: a case study of USAID/Guinea. April 13, 1999. USAID/PPC/CDIE/POA, Washington, D.C.

McGahuey, M. 1999. Natural resource management and democratic governance. Unpublished draft paper, July 27, 1999. USAID/AFR/SD/ANRE, Washington, D.C.

Okoth-Ogendo, H.W.O. and G.W. Tumushabe (eds). 1999. *Governing the environment: political change and natural resources management in eastern and southern Africa*. ACTS Press, Nairobi.

Olsen, S., Tobey, J. and M. Kerr. 1998. A common framework for learning from ICM experience. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 37 (2): 155-174.

Ribot, J. 1999. Framework for environmental governance. Unpublished paper, Workshop on Environmental Governance in Central Africa, Washington, D.C., 26-27 April, 1999. World Resources Institute, Washington, D.C.